

REMARKS

I. GENERAL

Claims 1-25, 28-31, and 35-40 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-25, 28-31, and 35 stand rejected. Claims 4-6, 13, 15-17, 19, 22, and 24 have been amended herein. Claims 1-3, 10-12, 14, 25-35 have been canceled in this or a previous Response. Further, claims 36-40 are new. The issues raised in the Non-Final Office Action of August 31, 2010 (“Current Action”) are as follows:

- The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) with respect to the beam formers recited in claims 22 and 23;
- Claims 4, 15-18, and 22-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims;
- Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-14, 19-21, 25, 28-29, 31, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,817,024 issued to Ogle et al. (hereafter “Ogle”); and
- Claims 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogle in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,695,783 issued to Henderson et al. (hereafter “Henderson”).

Applicant thanks Examiner for the conditional allowance of claims 4, 15-18, and 22-24. The claims have been amended herein in accordance with Examiner’s suggestions. Therefore, Applicant believes that claims 4, 15-18, and 22-24 are in condition for allowance. Applicant traverses the remaining rejections and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal in light of the remarks presented herein.

II. AMENDMENTS

The Current Action states that claims 4, 15-18, and 22-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but that they would allowable if rewritten into independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Current Action at 6. Applicant has amended claims 4, 15-18, and 22-24, as is described below, in accordance with Examiner's recommendation. As such, Applicant believes claims 4, 15-18, and 22-24 are therefore in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the objections of record for these claims be withdrawn in light of the following amendments.

Claim 4 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 1 (base claim) and intervening claims 2 and 3. Accordingly, claims 1-3 have been canceled. Claim 5, which previously depended from claim 3, has been amended to depend from claim 4. Further, claim 6, which previously depended from claim 1, has been amended to depend from claim 4. Therefore, these amendments add no new subject matter.

Claim 15 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 12 (base claim) and 14 (intervening claim). Further, claim 19, which previously depended from claim 12, has been amended to depend from claim 15. Therefore, these amendments add no new subject matter. Further, claims 36 is new and depends directly from claim 15. Support for this amendment may be found in the Specification as filed at least at paragraphs [0020] and [0021]. Therefore, these amendments add no new subject matter.

Claim 16 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 12 (base claim) and 14 (intervening claim). Therefore, these amendments add no new subject matter. Further, claims 37-40 are new and depend from directly or indirectly from claim 16. Support for these amendments may be found in the Specification as filed at least at paragraphs [0020], [0021], and [0030]. Therefore, these amendments add no new subject matter.

Claim 17 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 12 (base claim). There is no intervening claim. Accordingly, claim 12 has been canceled. Therefore, this amendment adds no new subject matter.

Claim 22 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 12 (base claim). There is no intervening claim. Therefore, this amendment adds no new subject matter.

Claim 24 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 12 (base claim). There is no intervening claim. Therefore, this amendment adds no new subject matter.

III. DRAWING OBJECTIONS

Page 2 of the Current Action states that the drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as failing to show the two beam formers recited in claims 22 and 23. Claim 22 recites, in part, “implementing two beam formers in communication with the data path; and operating the two beam formers and a transducer array to form multiple receive beams.” Further, claim 23 recites, in part, “operating the two beam formers and the transducer array to form a multi-line receive operation.” The use of two beam formers is shown in the existing Figures, for example, at Figure 3B, elements 330 and 340. With respect to Figure 3B, the Specification states, in part, that such an embodiment may be “used . . . to define a number of receive signal channels for processing by a number of beam formers (often increasing a total number of receive channels).” Application at paragraph [0037]. Further, “[s]ince one transmit may be used to examine points on multiple lines, such systems may utilize a receive operation that gathers information for multiple lines at one time for a single transmit. Such an operation may be referred to as a ‘multi-line.’” *Id.* As such, the two beam formers recited in claims 22 (which has been incorporated through this Response into claim 46) are both depicted in the Figures and described in the Specification. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection of record for claims 22 and 23 be withdrawn.

IV. CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 4, 15-18, and 22-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As noted above in Section II, *infra*, several amendments have been made in accordance with the recommendation provided in the Current Action. Therefore, claims 4, 15-18, and 22-24 should be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that the objections of record for these claims be withdrawn.

V. CLAIM REJECTIONS

A. 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

1. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-14, 19-21, 25, 28-29, 31, and 35 in view of Ogle

On pages 1-4 of the Current Action, claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-14, 19-21, 25, 28-29, 31, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogle. As described above, Applicant has amended claims 4, 15-17, 22, and 24 into independent form, and incorporated the subject matter indicated as allowable. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 12, and 14 have been canceled herein. As such, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections of record for claims 1-3, 12, and 14 are now moot. In light of these amendments, Applicant believes that independent claims 4, 15-17, 22, and 24 are now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections of record for these claims.

Dependent claims 5-9, 13, 18-21, and 23 depend (previously or by modification in the Current Action) either directly or indirectly from independent claims 4, 17, or 22, which have each been amended to include subject matter indicated in the Current Action as allowable. As such, claims 5-9, 13, 18-21, and 23 inherit all the limitations of their respective base claims and are allowable based at least on their dependency from their respective base claims, 4, 17, or 22. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections of record for claims 5-9, 13, 18-21, and 23 be withdrawn.

Further, claims 10-11, 25, 28-31, and 35 have been canceled herein merely to expedite issuance of claims having subject matter indicated as allowable in the Current Action. This cancellation should not be construed as an admission regarding the patentability of these claims. Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections of record for claims 10-11, 25, 28-31, and 35 are moot.

B. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

1. Claims 8 and 9 over Ogle in view of Henderson

On pages 5-6 of the Current Action, claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogle in view of Henderson. Dependent claims 8 and 9 depend indirectly from independent claim 4. As noted above, claim 4 has been amended to incorporate subject matter indicated as allowable. Further, dependent claims 8 and 9 inherit every limitation of claim 4. Thus, claims 8 and 9 should be allowable at least based on their dependency from claim 4. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of record for claims 8 and 9 be withdrawn.

VI. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. Please charge any required fees or credit any fee overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-2380, under Order No. 65744/P018US/10404217 during the of this Application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.16 through 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees.

Dated: November 30, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By R. Ross Viguet
R. Ross Viguet
Registration No.: 42,203
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201-2784
(214) 855-8185
(214) 855-8200 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant